

CORRESPONDENCE

Race Crossing

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—None of the participants in the correspondence concerning human races in your columns seem to be aware that the questions raised can be largely solved by methods due to Darlington. If the European and negro races are so different as to merit the title of species they will probably have a different chromosomal structure. This will cause characteristic anomalies in the meiosis of hybrids which are not found in the pure races.

If on the other hand no such anomalies are found, the differences are presumably due to genes, such as are responsible for the variation within a species. All that is needed to clear up the problem is a supply of properly fixed testes, and the services of one of the few cytologists who possess the requisite technical ability.

It is however most unlikely that the research will be undertaken, if only because most people have made up their minds on the race problem, and would not welcome a search for evidence which might prove them wrong.

J. B. S. HALDANE.

University College,
Gower Street, W.C.1.

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—In my letter in your last issue, instead of "the whole of the Bovidae" I should have written "the group of the Bovidae including cattle, zebu, bison, yaks, etc." The species in this group are interfertile, with only slight indications of sterility in certain crosses. Mr. Julian Huxley has avoided my point that infertility as a criterion of species is out of date and is no longer applicable to animals, to plants or to man himself.

All the modern paleontological evidence regarding man goes to show that the mongoloid, caucasoid, negroid and australoid types of man have evolved separately over long periods in geographical isolation from each other. In any other group of organisms the differences they show would be regarded as specific. The idea of *Homo sapiens* grew up in the days of the "lumpers" of species, and has survived because it placated man's vanity to suppose that there is only one living human species. This idea is not supported by examination from a critical point of view.

Mr. Huxley protests against the description of *We Europeans* as a propagandist work. Since it seeks to deny that even human races exist, it flies in the face of facts patent to everyone and fundamental to anthropologists. It therefore ranks itself as a propagandist rather than a scientific work.

R. RUGGLES GATES.

King's College, London.

Nordics and Jews

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—Surely Mr. Thompson in his letter which you publish in the July number of the *Review* has beaten *Little Arthur* for simplification of history. Quite a number of events happened between the time of Edward I and Elizabeth that may have contributed to England's blossoming under that great queen. By parity of reasoning, the apogee of England's political greatness, the Victorian Age, was a result of the admission of Jews under Cromwell. It would be surprising if such actions as the freeing of the West Indian slaves, at a cost to this country of twenty million pounds, was the result of a small leavening of any people. Will not Mr. Thompson give facts *proving* the pernicious influence of the Jews in this country? No marks will be given for general statements and personal opinions. Clear statements of cause and effect are required, such as may be hoped for in scientific journals.

C. G. SELIGMAN.

Court Leys, Toot Baldon,
Oxford.

Policy of the Society

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—Our *Society* changed its name a short time ago from *The Eugenics Education Society* to *The Eugenics Society*, presumably to indicate that its efforts were henceforth to be limited no longer to educating the public in eugenics, but were to include others of a more practical nature. Yet even to-day one might almost say that the only forms of practical eugenics ever discussed, even among eugenists themselves, in England at least, are voluntary sterilization of aments, and voluntary pre-marital schedules, on the one hand, and the encouragement, on the other, of increased effective fertility among the more efficient sections of society. Birth-control cannot be called practical eugenics, since it is generally made to serve purely selfish ends.

Now, Sir, it is universally admitted that, as long as we limit our endeavours to this sort of propaganda work, results will be very slow to show themselves. Can we afford to go so slowly? If other nations work faster and succeed in bringing about rapid improvement in their human stock—nations, moreover, who are troubled with no scruples about ways and means for securing to themselves the territory they need and the survival which they believe to be the birth-right of the fittest—shall we continue to live as a nation at all until the results of our slow and cautious methods have had time to become perceptible?